THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL.

Writ Petition (M/S) No. 1431 of 2006

Geeta Chhimwal, D/O Sri P.N. Chhimwal, R/O C/O Sri Santosh Chhimwal, Shubham Medical Store, Nagar Palika Market, Ramnagar, Nainital.

…. **Petitioner**.

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal, through Secretary, Education (Basic), Uttaranchal, Dehradun.
2. Director, Basic Education, Uttaranchal, Dehradun.
3. The Additional Director, S.C.E.R.T., Narendra Nagar, Tehri Garhwal.
4. Principal, District Education & Training Institute, Bhimtal, Nainital.

…. **Respondents.**

Sri Anil Dabral, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Sri Nand Prasad, learned standing counsel for the State-respondents.

Dated September 26, 2006.
PC: (Hon'ble B.S. Verma, J.)

(Interim Relief Application No. 12075 of 2006)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties and perused the record.

By means of this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding/directing the respondents to consider the candidature of the petitioner for selection of the Special B.T.C. Training course 2006-2007 and also mandamus of this court commanding them to extend the benefit of Government G.O. dated 19-3-2005 regarding relaxation of age.

By the Government Order dated 1-8-2006 clarification has been issued by the Government of Uttaranchal regarding the queries made by the Director of Education vide letter No.

22501/2006-2007 dated 29-7-2006. By this G.O. provision of relaxation in age was clarified for the applicants who had applied for Special B.T.C. Training in the year 2001 and who attained age above 40 years on 1.7.2004.

Admittedly, the petitioner herein had not applied for the said course during the year 2001 for the Special B.T.C. Training course, therefore, no benefit of the said G.O. dated 19-3-2005 could be extended to her. The learned counsel for the petitioner could not show that petitioner had in fact applied in the year 2001 despite sufficient opportunity given to him.

In any view of the matter, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is devoid of merit and no interim relief can be granted to the petitioner. Accordingly the writ petition is dismissed in-limine.

(B.S. Verma, J.)

RCP